DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 233 EA 009 944

AUTHOR Fletcher, Richard K., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Tennessee Educators' Viewpoints Regarding Professional Negotiations. A Research Study.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Technological Univ., Cookeville. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Phi Delta Kappa Research Foundation, Bloomington, Ind.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 45p.; Tables may not reproduce clearly

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Attitudes; *Collective Bargaining; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Questionnaires; School Personnel; *School Superintendents; *State Surveys; Statistical Data; *Teacher Attitudes; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes toward collective bargaining of teachers, principals, central office staff, and superintendents employed by Tennessee's public school systems. A 10-item opinionnaire was completed by personnel in 160 Tennessee schools. The results of this attitude questionnaire indicated that, as a whole, Tennessee school personnel supported organizations that advocate the use of professional negotiations; however, the superintendents were the exception. Teachers tended to favor collective bargaining and the passage of legislation allowing for it more strongly than any other personnel group. The withholding of services (or striking) received only mixed reaction; the teachers were evenly split on the question, with about 30 percent undecided, while the superintendents were, of course, opposed to it. The authors recommend that joint study of the issue and involvement of teachers and administrators, especially superintendents, might resolve some of their areas of disagreement. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED144233

Tennessee Educators' Viewpoints Regarding Professional Negotiations

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard K. Fletcher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM"

A Research Study

by

Dr. Richard K. Fletcher, Jr., Project Director
and Associate Professor Secondary Education and Foundations

Dr. Jack L. Brimm
Associate Professor Administration, Supervision and Curriculum

Dr. Daniel J. Tollett, Chairman of Dept. and
Associate Professor Administration, Supervision and Curriculum

Dr. O. C. Stewart, Dean
Division of Extended Services and Professor
Administration, Supervision and Curriculum

Sponsored by

The Phi Delta Kappa Research Foundation
and Tennessee Tech Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa

August, 1976

EA 009 944

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are deeply indebted to a number of individuals who assisted in the completion of this project. Particularly, appreciation is given to Mr. Herman W. Roberson, Jr., who keypunched all of the data, researched the literature and wrote a comprehensive draft of the findings as a part of his Ed.S. program of studies. This condensed version is based heavily on his work.

Sincere appreciation is offered to Mr. Greg Deck for his efforts in getting the manuscript typed. The assistance offered by the departmental secretary in Secondary Education and Foundations is gratefully acknowledged and appreciated.

The assistance offered by the 2500 school personnel is much appreciated and the financial support from Phi Delta Kappa made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	2
HYPOTHESES	2
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	3
DEFINITION OF TERMS	4
SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION	4
ANALYSIS OF DATA	6
OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE REGARDING PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS.	7
PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	9
DATA RELATIVE TO THE FIVE HYPOTHESES	11
SUMMARY	24
RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS	25
FOOTNOTES	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	
APPENDIX	

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Attitudinal Comparisons on Items 1-10 Total Group	10
II	Attitudinal Comparisons by Sex on Items 1-10	12
III	Attitudinal Comparisons by Age on Items 1 - 10 - Total Group	14-15
IV	Attitudinal Comparisons by Job on Items 1 - 10 - Total Group	17-18
V	Attitudinal Comparisons by Tenure on Items 1 - 10 - Total Group	20
VI	Attitudinal Comparisons by School Size on Items 1 - 10 - Total Group	22-23

ATTITUDE OF TENNESSEE SCHOOL PERSONNEL TOWARD ORGANIZED NEGOTIATIONS AND/OR ARBITRATION

The attitudes and feelings of teachers across the nation regarding public education are beginning to change and there are numerous indications that the teaching profession as a whole is becoming more militant. The National Education Association reports that more than 70 percent of all certified public school employees are under contract or are in systems which are negotiating. N.E.A. leaders predict that within five years that figure will move to more than 90 percent. The national trend toward collective bargaining makes educators fearful that adversary relationships might develop between teachers and administrators. During the 1974-75 school year there was increased evidence that Tennessee teachers are becoming more politically active and perhaps, even supportive of teacher militancy.

Phi Delta Kappa members are educational leaders and as such they must direct their energies and talents to the improvement of their profession. An important leadership function is to obtain research data regarding crucial issues and concerns so that intelligent and fair judgments may be rendered. Though professional negotiations is viewed by many as a constructive process, there are misconceptions and erroneous ideas associated with the concept. Since the overwhelming majority of educators in Tennessee are neophytes in the truest

sense of the word with regard to collective bargaining and negotiations, it is imperative that this issue receive immediate attention. A necessary first step, and one of significant importance, is to obtain research data on the attitudes of school personnel toward collective bargaining and negotiations.

A preliminary investigation of this topic has been completed by Fletcher. This study involved 379 teachers and other school personnel groups from 11 counties in the Upper Cumberland Region of Tennessee. Approximately 80 percent of those surveyed agreed that school personnel should support organizations which advocate arbitration and/or negotiations, while 70 percent supported the passage of state or federal laws which would legalize negotiations.[1]

PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

Tennessee is one of twenty states which does not have collective bargaining legislation for teachers; however, a few school systems in the state presently do bargain collectively with their boards of education. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of teachers, principals, central office staff, and superintendents employed by Tennessee's public school systems toward organized negotiations and/or arbitration.

HYPOTHESES

Besides obtaining descriptive data related to educator's

attitudes toward negotiations, the following null hypotheses were developed and gave direction to this study:

1. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between male and female professional school personnel.
2. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between various age groups of educators.
3. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between professional school personnel responsibility groups.
4. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between tenured and nontenured educators.
5. There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between educators from various size school districts.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

There seems to be little doubt that teachers throughout the state of Tennessee are becoming more militant. Teachers from Bedford County recently voted overwhelmingly to strike if their county court did not approve the school board's proposed salary increase. Metro Nashville schools are only now beginning to return to normal after the confrontation this spring between the teacher's association and the school board which culminated in a teacher slowdown. School personnel from a number of other counties in Tennessee have not ruled out the possibility of a strike as they continue to work with their boards of education and county courts to obtain more money for salaries and other needed items.

This study was predicated on the assumption that if superintendents, education associations, and teachers know more about how Tennessee educators feel about professional negotiations, then more appropriate actions and effective policies could be formulated for the benefit of all parties, thus minimizing the clevages between teachers and administrators if collective bargaining should become a reality in the state. The findings from this research investigation should provide valuable information for school administrators, school boards, fiscal bodies, and teachers as they strive to better understand the attitudes and feelings of professional school personnel.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are defined:

Negotiations-- a process whereby employers and employees strive to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on items of concern.

Arbitration-- a process involving a disinterested third party in the resolution of a disagreement between parties.

Small School District--a school district employing less than 300 teachers.

Medium School District-- a school district employing 300 to 1000 teachers.

Large School District-- a school district employing over 1000 teachers.

SAMPLING AND DATA COLLECTION

The instrument used for this study was a ten item

opinionnaire developed by Fletcher. (Appendix A) It was field tested in a research investigation involving 379 public school educators from 11 counties in the Upper Cumberland Region of Tennessee and modified accordingly.

The population from which the sample was drawn consisted of teachers, principals, central office staff, and superintendents listed in Tennessee's 1975-1976 Directory of Public Schools.[2] From the listings, the sample selected included every superintendent, every seventh school, and every fourth central office staff member. Only Nashville Metropolitan School System was completely omitted from the survey because of a school board policy regarding participation in research surveys. The sampling procedure resulted in the selection of 238 schools, 146 superintendents and 308 professional central office staff members. Each superintendent and selected central office staff member was mailed an introductory letter, opinionnaire, and pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope. The principals in the 238 schools were mailed a sufficient number of opinionnaires for their faculties and themselves, a pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope, and an introductory letter which requested that a third party collect and return all opinionnaires in order to guarantee anonymity for each respondent. Opinionnaires were received from March 24, through April 15, 1976.

The opinionnaires were returned by 160 or 67.2 percent of the selected schools: when divided into school size, small schools returned 81 of the 127 mailed (63.8%), medium schools

returned 36 of the 53 mailed (67.9%), and large schools returned 43 of the 58 mailed (74.1%). According to the 1975-1976 Directory of Public Schools the potential number of teachers employed at the selected 238 schools was 5171. The 160 participating schools produced responses from 2013 teachers and 178 principals. It was impossible to determine the percentage of returns from each school since anonymity was guaranteed for individual systems. The 178 principals exceeded the 160 schools due to more than one principal in some schools. These 178 responses by principals represent 74.8 percent based upon the 238 sampled. However, the number of principals based on the 160 schools which responded represent returns from only 67.2 percent. Central office staff members returned 200 of the 308 mailed (64.9%) and 83 of the superintendents returned the opinionnaires (56.9%).

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of data was completed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (S.P.S.S.), "an integrated system of computer programs designed for the analysis of social data,"[3] on file at Tennessee Technological University's D. W. Mattson Computer Center. This program was employed for computing a oneway analysis of variance which yields for each subgroup the frequency counts, means, standard deviations, F-ratios, and F-probabilities. This significance test was one of the two methods for determining trends across categories of the independent variables associated with the

aforementioned hypotheses. The 0.05 level was used to determine the significance of each of the ten attitudinal items.

Contingency table analysis (or crosstabulation), "a joint frequency distribution of cases according to two or more classificatory variables,"[4] was used as a second method for comparing the subgroups within the independent variables. The CROSSTABS Program produced frequency counts with respective percentages as well as a significance test utilizing a two-way chi-square statistic and the probability level.[5] This test was computed for each of the ten attitudinal items for each null hypothesis. The flexibility offered in the S.P.S.S. program also enabled the researchers to isolate any subgroup such as small, medium, and large districts and specific job, sex, or age specifications.

OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE REGARDING PROFESSIONAL NEGOTIATIONS

The research literature contains numerous studies related to attitudes of school personnel toward professional negotiations. Many investigations have sought to establish a relationship between attitudes and such characteristics as sex, age and jobs.

Wilson[6] and Fisher[7] surveyed teachers to determine their attitudes toward collective negotiations and found that male teachers had more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than female teachers. Evans[8] used a 25 item questionnaire to identify various militant actions one might take during negotiations and found that men would be much more

militant in their actions than women. However, Garver[9] reported no difference in attitudes between male and female principals with regard to collective bargaining.

The data are unclear on the relationship between age and attitudes towards professional negotiations. Carver[10] and Wilson[11] indicate that attitudes of teachers toward collective action is affected only slightly by age. If a trend is indicated, it appears that the younger teachers have more favorable attitudes toward negotiations than the older educators.

Some research investigations have focused on job responsibility and its relationship to attitudes regarding professional negotiations. It is noted that while principals, superintendents, and teacher groups seemingly accept the concept of professional negotiations, each of these respective groups differed on numerous specific points relative to negotiations. Principals question the impact of collective bargaining on their school system as a whole and their position in particular.[12] Shell[13] found that Oklahoma superintendents were overwhelmingly against mandatory state negotiation legislation. O'Hare[14] reported that superintendents agreed that teachers have the right to negotiate collectively with the local school board, but they (superintendents) were against teacher strikes and the enactment of any state negotiation statute. Queen[15] discovered superintendents were ambivalent in their feelings towards negotiations but all were concerned about their specific role in the negotiation process. While teachers

generally supported the concept of negotiations, there was some concern among their ranks that education associations not assume a labor oriented point of view (AFL-CIO) and that teachers be separated from the other public employees.[16] Teachers were more militant in their views toward strikes than the principal and superintendent groups and most teachers seem to indicate that "strikes are justified under certain conditions."[17]

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The overall results from this investigation as indicated in Table I show that 69 percent of the educators agreed with them in that professional school personnel should support organizations which advocate negotiations. The results from item two indicate almost two-thirds of those surveyed believed TEA/NEA was the organization which could best demand and acquire salaries and other benefits for school personnel. On item three a majority of the respondents favored the passage of a state or federal law which would provide for professional negotiations. There was some conjecture among the educators on item four regarding how their communities might react to the negotiation process. Although a third of the group agreed that their community would support school personnel in negotiations, two-thirds of the educators were either uncertain about community reaction or disagreed that their community would offer support.

Educators responding to item five believed that the

TABLE I
ATTITUDINAL COMPARISONS ON ITEMS 1-10--TOTAL GROUP

Item	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean
1	720(29.0%)	986(39.7%)	421(17.0%)	241(9.7%)	114(4.6%)	2.21
2	582(23.4%)	975(39.2%)	545(21.9%)	273(11.0%)	112(4.5%)	2.34
3	619(24.0%)	897(36.1%)	560(22.6%)	269(10.8%)	137(5.5%)	2.36
4	208(8.4%)	442(17.8%)	495(19.9%)	996(40.1%)	343(13.8%)	3.33
5	170(6.8%)	677(27.2%)	854(34.3%)	589(23.7%)	198(8.0%)	2.98
6	321(12.9%)	847(34.1%)	648(26.1%)	555(22.4%)	110(4.4%)	2.71
7	313(12.6%)	437(18.4%)	762(30.7%)	554(22.3%)	400(16.1%)	3.10
8	381(15.3%)	533(21.4%)	683(27.5%)	551(22.2%)	337(13.6%)	2.97
9	171(6.9%)	341(13.7%)	901(36.3%)	710(28.6%)	359(14.5%)	3.30
10	260(10.5%)	680(27.6%)	649(26.3%)	659(26.7%)	219(8.9%)	2.96

15

professional harmony between teachers and administrators would not be weakened because of negotiations, but almost 50 percent of those answering item six felt that job security would be jeopardized if school personnel withheld their services. Educators were divided among themselves on item seven, eight and nine with regard to the withholding of services. More school personnel disagreed than agreed that professional services should be withheld for greater salaries (item seven) and involvement in professional concerns (item nine) such as policy making, but there were mixed feelings about service withdrawal relative to smaller classes, fewer non-teaching duties and more supplies (item eight).

Conflicting attitudes were revealed among the educators with regard to the negotiations process protecting the incompetent teacher as noted in item ten. While more educators agreed than disagreed with the item, many respondents were uncertain about this.

DATA RELATIVE TO THE FIVE HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis I - There will be no significant difference in responses toward negotiations between male and female professional school personnel.

The hypothesis was rejected for each of the ten items using the chi-square test. However, the F-ratio statistic showed the hypothesis was accepted for items 1, 3, 7, 9, 10 and rejected for items 2, 4, 6, and 8.

The results depicted on Table II show that significantly more females than males agreed that TEA-NEA was the organization

TABLE II
ATTITUDINAL COMPARISONS BY SEX ON ITEMS 1 - 10

12.

Item	Sex	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std. Dev.	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Square	Signif icance
1	M	840	[illegible](32.1%)	310(36.9%)	113(13.5%)	93(11.1%)	54(6.4%)	2.23	1.19	.340	.565	27.97	.0000
	F	1626	448(27.6%)	668(41.1%)	306(18.8%)	145(8.9%)	59(3.6%)	2.20	1.10				
2	M	842	208(24.7%)	285(33.8%)	192(22.8%)	101(12.0%)	56(6.7%)	2.42	1.17	7.367	.007	24.77	.0001
	F	1629	372(22.8%)	684(42.0%)	349(21.4%)	168(10.3%)	56(3.4%)	2.30	1.04				
3	M	844	258(30.6%)	270(32.0%)	143(16.9%)	98(11.6%)	75(8.9%)	2.36	1.27	.034	.657	66.84	.0000
	F	1622	358(22.1%)	623(38.4%)	413(25.5%)	166(10.2%)	62(3.8%)	2.35	1.05				
4	M	840	117(13.9%)	160(19.0%)	128(15.2%)	300(35.7%)	135(16.1%)	3.21	1.31	14.817	.000	74.63	.0000
	F	1628	88(5.4%)	278(17.1%)	365(22.4%)	690(42.4%)	207(12.7%)	3.40	1.08				
5	M	843	67(7.9%)	216(25.6%)	263(31.2%)	222(26.3%)	75(8.9%)	3.03	1.10	1.924	.162	13.26	.0001
	F	1629	101(6.2%)	455(28.1%)	588(36.1%)	362(22.2%)	120(7.4%)	2.96	1.02				
6	M	844	106(12.6%)	285(33.8%)	178(21.1%)	221(26.2%)	54(6.4%)	2.80	1.15	8.355	.004	32.37	.0000
	F	1621	211(13.0%)	557(34.4%)	468(28.9%)	329(20.3%)	56(3.5%)	2.67	1.05				
7	M	843	127(15.1%)	167(19.84)	225(26.7%)	170(20.2%)	154(18.3%)	3.07	1.32	1.196	.274	20.69	.0004
	F	1628	186(11.4%)	286(17.6%)	536(32.9%)	378(23.2%)	242(14.9%)	3.13	1.21				
8	M	840	142(16.9%)	152(18.1%)	206(24.5%)	199(23.7%)	141(16.8%)	3.05	1.33	5.528	.018	23.85	.0001
	F	1630	238(14.6%)	377(23.1%)	474(29.1%)	347(21.3%)	194(11.9%)	2.53	1.22				
9	M	841	72(8.6%)	119(14.1%)	253(30.1%)	246(29.3%)	151(18.0%)	3.34	1.18	1.586	.205	24.28	.0000
	F	1626	99(6.1%)	219(13.5%)	641(39.4%)	461(28.4%)	206(12.9%)	3.23	1.04				
10	M	840	115(13.7%)	234(27.9%)	177(21.1%)	214(25.5%)	100(11.9%)	2.94	1.25	.323	.574	39.6	.0000
	F	1611	143(8.9%)	441(27.4%)	470(29.2%)	438(27.2%)	119(7.4%)	2.97	1.09				

best equipped to represent teachers. As previously mentioned, over 50 percent of both response groups disagreed that professional harmony would be weakened by negotiations, but of those respondents who did agree with the item, significantly more males than females felt professional harmony would be threatened.

Although most respondents agreed that job security would be jeopardized if school personnel withheld their services, there were those who disagreed with the item and again, significantly more men than women were in this category. The threat of withholding services as a means of improving salaries, working conditions, and fringe benefits was viewed with significantly more disdain by male educators than females. The large degree of uncertainty which occurred among the respondents on items 1, 3, 7, 9 and 10 was probably one of the major factors affecting significance on the F-ratio statistic but not on the chi-square test.

Hypothesis 2 - There will be no significant difference in attitudes towards negotiations between various age groups of educators.

The hypothesis was accepted for item five and rejected for items, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 when the F-ratio was computed. The results from the chi-square test indicated significant differences on all ten items. As shown in Table III each of the respondents was placed in one of five age categories: A=under 25; B=25-29; C=30-39; D=40-49; and E over 50.

Generally, it was found that educators in the groups

TABLE III

ATTITUDINAL COMPARISONS BY AGE ON ITEMS 1 - 10 - TOTAL GROUP

Item	Age	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std. Dev.	F Ratio	F Prod	Chi Sq	Signif icance
1	A	227	56(24.7%)	114(50.2%)	44(19.4%)	9(4.0%)	4(1.8%)	2.08	.87	21.408	.000	133.55	.0000
	B	568	180(31.7%)	272(47.9%)	85(15.0%)	25(4.4%)	6(1.1%)	1.95	.86				
	C	607	208(34.3%)	228(37.6%)	96(15.8%)	46(7.6%)	29(4.8%)	2.11	1.11				
	D	516	140(27.1%)	173(33.5%)	88(17.1%)	82(15.9%)	33(6.4%)	2.41	1.22				
	E	541	131(24.2%)	190(35.1%)	103(19.0%)	76(14.0%)	41(7.6%)	2.46	1.31				
2	A	227	28(12.3%)	102(44.9%)	65(28.6%)	29(12.8%)	3(1.3%)	2.46	.91	7.313	.000	79.25	.0000
	B	569	110(19.3%)	218(38.3%)	153(26.9%)	57(10.0%)	31(5.4%)	2.44	1.08				
	C	608	141(23.2%)	221(36.3%)	140(23.0%)	76(12.5%)	30(4.9%)	2.40	1.12				
	D	517	140(27.1%)	182(35.2%)	111(21.5%)	58(11.2%)	26(5.0%)	2.32	1.13				
	E	542	158(29.2%)	244(45.0%)	71(13.1%)	48(8.9%)	21(3.9%)	2.13	1.05				
3	A	227	46(20.3%)	96(42.3%)	72(31.7%)	11(4.8%)	2(.9%)	2.24	.86	30.234	.000	174.11	.0000
	B	569	162(28.5%)	260(45.7%)	111(19.5%)	28(4.9%)	8(1.4%)	2.05	.90				
	C	606	192(31.7%)	202(33.3%)	130(21.5%)	56(9.2%)	26(4.3%)	2.21	1.12				
	D	514	117(22.8%)	155(30.2%)	113(22.0%)	83(16.1%)	46(8.9%)	2.58	1.25				
	E	543	98(18.0%)	179(33.0%)	127(23.4%)	85(15.7%)	54(9.9%)	2.66	1.22				
4	A	227	5(2.2%)	24(10.6%)	65(28.6%)	103(45.4%)	30(13.2%)	3.57	.93	24.046	.000	135.49	.0000
	B	567	14(2.5%)	70(12.3%)	121(21.3%)	275(48.5%)	87(15.3%)	3.62	.97				
	C	606	51(8.4%)	96(15.8%)	115(19.0%)	244(40.3%)	100(16.5%)	3.41	1.18				
	D	516	64(12.4%)	120(23.3%)	87(16.9%)	178(34.5%)	67(13.0%)	3.12	1.26				
	E	545	71(13.0%)	128(23.5%)	101(18.5%)	188(34.5%)	57(10.5%)	3.06	1.23				
5	A	226	11(4.9%)	72(31.9%)	87(38.5%)	50(22.1%)	6(2.7%)	2.86	.91	1.911	.105	38.66	.0012
	B	569	33(5.8%)	152(26.7%)	228(40.1%)	122(21.4%)	34(6.0%)	2.95	.98				
	C	607	43(7.1%)	176(29.0%)	197(32.5%)	140(23.1%)	51(8.4%)	2.97	1.07				
	D	517	44(8.5%)	123(23.8%)	158(30.6%)	138(26.7%)	54(10.4%)	3.07	1.12				
	E	546	37(6.8%)	151(27.7%)	176(32.2%)	133(24.4%)	49(9.0%)	3.01	1.07				

Continued on next page

Item	Age	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std Dev	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Sq	Signif icance
6	A	227	33(14.5%)	75(33.0%)	73(32.2%)	40(17.6%)	6(2.6%)	2.61	1.02	3.250	.012	28.18	.0301
	B	568	72(12.7%)	175(30.8%)	162(28.5%)	138(24.3%)	21(3.7%)	2.76	1.07				
	C	607	68(11.2%)	201(33.1%)	150(24.7%)	156(25.7%)	32(5.7%)	2.81	1.10				
	D	515	62(12.0%)	187(36.3%)	123(23.9%)	116(22.5%)	27(5.2%)	2.73	1.10				
	E	540	79(14.6%)	201(37.2%)	138(25.6%)	98(18.1%)	24(4.4%)	2.61	1.08				
7	A	226	21(9.3%)	53(23.5%)	79(35.0%)	52(23.0%)	21(9.3%)	3.00	1.10	38.337	.000	161.41	.0000
	B	567	106(18.7%)	133(23.5%)	180(31.7%)	99(17.5%)	49(8.6%)	2.74	1.20				
	C	609	94(15.4%)	129(21.2%)	195(32.0%)	112(18.4%)	79(13.0%)	2.92	1.24				
	D	516	53(10.3%)	77(14.9%)	150(29.1%)	124(24.0%)	112(21.7%)	3.32	1.25				
	E	545	37(6.8%)	62(11.4%)	153(28.1%)	159(29.2%)	134(24.6%)	3.53	1.17				
8	A	227	24(10.6%)	63(27.8%)	75(33.0%)	45(19.8%)	20(8.8%)	2.89	1.12	32.695	.000	152.31	.0000
	B	567	131(23.1%)	136(24.0%)	170(30.0%)	90(15.9%)	40(7.1%)	2.60	1.20				
	C	608	107(17.6%)	141(23.2%)	179(29.4%)	113(18.6%)	68(11.2%)	2.83	1.24				
	D	516	71(13.8%)	89(17.2%)	123(23.8%)	138(26.7%)	95(18.4%)	3.19	1.30				
	E	543	45(8.3%)	97(17.9%)	132(24.3%)	158(29.1%)	111(20.4%)	3.36	1.22				
9	A	227	14(6.2%)	28(12.3%)	96(42.3%)	66(29.1%)	23(10.1%)	3.25	1.00	16.293	.000	81.78	.0000
	B	566	46(8.1%)	100(17.7%)	230(40.6%)	139(24.6%)	51(9.0%)	3.09	1.05				
	C	608	53(8.7%)	94(15.5%)	228(37.5%)	150(24.7%)	83(13.7%)	3.19	1.12				
	D	515	37(7.2%)	64(12.4%)	159(30.9%)	159(30.9%)	96(18.6%)	3.41	1.14				
	E	543	21(3.9%)	53(9.8%)	177(32.6%)	187(34.4%)	105(19.3%)	3.56	1.03				
10	A	227	12(5.3%)	65(28.6%)	88(38.8%)	44(19.4%)	18(7.9%)	2.96	1.01	15.557	.000	102.31	.0000
	B	560	42(7.5%)	122(21.8%)	162(29.1%)	172(30.7%)	61(10.9%)	3.16	1.11				
	C	605	52(8.6%)	143(23.6%)	168(27.8%)	176(29.1%)	66(10.9%)	3.10	1.14				
	D	515	67(13.0%)	162(31.5%)	107(20.8%)	132(25.6%)	47(9.1%)	2.86	1.20				
	E	537	84(15.6%)	182(33.9%)	118(22.0%)	127(23.6%)	26(4.8%)	2.68	1.14				

under 40 years of age agreed more strongly than the older groups that school personnel should (1) support organizations advocating negotiations; (2) withhold their services for greater salaries and better working conditions; and (3) support the passage of laws providing for negotiations. Those educators under 40 years of age tended to disagree rather than agree with the item concerning the weakening of professional harmony because of negotiations, while the older group tended to believe that harmony would be negatively affected. Approximately 50 percent of the respondents from each of the five groups agreed that job security would be jeopardized if services were withheld; however, significantly fewer younger educators (under 25) and older educators (over 50) disagreed with the item than did the three groups of educators between 25 and 50 years of age. The older educators tended to agree that the incompetent teacher is protected by negotiations, while a significant percentage of young educators (under 25) were undecided and the 25-40 group tended to disagree more than agree with the item.

Hypothesis III - There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between professional school personnel responsibility groups.

The hypothesis was rejected for all ten items using both the chi square test and the F-ratio statistic. Thus it is noted that significant variation in attitudes exists between teachers and administration as noted in Table IV.

Seventy-five percent of the teachers agreed that school

TABLE IV

ATTITUDINAL COMPARISONS BY JOB ON ITEMS 1 - 10 - TOTAL GROUP

Item	JOB	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std Dev	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Sq.	Significance
1	TEA	1994	643(32.1%)	831(41.4%)	333(16.6%)	140(7.0%)	58(2.9%)	2.08	1.01	65.730	.0000	313.06	.0000
	PRN	171	41(23.2%)	71(40.1%)	32(18.1%)	19(10.7%)	14(7.9%)	2.42	1.19				
	COS	195	33(16.7%)	52(26.3%)	43(21.7%)	51(25.8%)	19(9.6%)	2.85	1.25				
	SUP	82	3(3.7%)	20(24.4%)	6(7.3%)	30(36.6%)	23(28.0%)	3.61	1.24				
2	TEA	2003	448(23.3%)	802(40.0%)	460(22.94	210(10.5%)	87(4.3%)	2.35	1.07	4.164	.0063	33.66	.0008
	PRN	172	61(34.3%)	65(36.5%)	28(15.7%)	20(11.2%)	4(2.2%)	2.09	1.06				
	COS	197	53(26.6%)	67(33.7%)	43(21.6%)	25(12.6%)	11(5.5%)	2.37	1.17				
	SUP	82	19(23.2%)	30(36.6%)	12(14.6%)	11(13.4%)	10(12.2%)	2.51	1.32				
3	TEA	1997	534(26.7%)	765(38.2%)	466(23.3%)	169(8.4%)	66(3.3%)	2.24	1.04	91.304	.0000	386.8	.0000
	PRN	172	47(26.4%)	56(31.5%)	41(23.0%)	22(12.4%)	12(6.7%)	2.42	1.21				
	COS	198	32(16.0%)	58(29.0%)	41(20.5%)	48(24.0%)	21(10.5%)	2.85	1.26				
	SUP	83	1(1.2%)	10(12.0%)	11(13.3%)	23(27.7%)	38(45.8%)	4.60	1.09				
4	TEA	1999	100(5.0%)	316(15.8%)	428(21.4%)	850(42.4%)	309(15.4%)	3.48	1.08	81.159	.0000	344.08	.0000
	PRN	172	22(12.4%)	36(20.2%)	30(16.9%)	73(41.0%)	17(9.6%)	3.14	1.21				
	COS	198	42(21.0%)	64(32.0%)	27(13.5%)	54(27.0%)	13(6.5%)	2.66	1.26				
	SUP	83	42(50.6%)	24(28.9%)	3(3.6%)	9(10.8%)	5(6.0%)	1.93	1.24				
5	TEA	2003	150(7.5%)	560(27.5%)	719(35.8%)	441(22.0%)	137(6.8%)	2.93	1.03	20.624	.0000	823.3	.0000
	PRN	172	9(5.14)	52(29.24)	57(32.0%)	45(25.3%)	15(8.4%)	2.04	1.03				
	COS	198	8(4.0%)	50(25.0%)	54(27.0%)	62(31.0%)	26(13.0%)	3.24	1.09				
	SUP	83	2(2.4%)	10(12.0%)	14(16.9%)	39(47.0%)	18(21.7%)	3.74	1.01				
6	TEA	1998	254(12.7%)	663(33.1%)	548(27.4%)	450(22.5%)	87(4.3%)	2.73	1.08	5.126	.0018	29.46	.0034
	PRN	171	25(14.1%)	68(38.4%)	31(17.5%)	44(24.9%)	9(5.1%)	2.72	1.14				
	COS	198	25(12.5%)	72(36.0%)	47(23.5%)	47(23.5%)	9(4.5%)	2.72	1.10				
	SUP	83	21(25.3%)	35(42.2%)	16(19.3%)	7(8.4%)	4(4.8%)	2.25	1.08				
7	TEA	2003	281(14.0%)	399(19.9%)	655(32.6%)	429(21.4%)	243(12.1%)	2.98	1.21	58.131	.0000	270.61	.0000
	PRN	172	19(10.7%)	27(15.2%)	52(29.2%)	38(21.3%)	42(23.6%)	3.30	1.28				
	COS	197	11(5.5%)	22(11.1%)	41(20.6%)	59(29.6%)	66(33.2%	3.74	1.20				
	SUP	83	1(1.24)	2(2.4%)	8(9.6%)	24(28.9%)	48(57.8%)	4.40	.86				

Continued on next page

Item	Job	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq (%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std Dev	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Sq	Signif icance
8	TEA	2006	335(16.7%)	462(23.0%)	594(29.6%)	415(20.6%)	204(10.1%)	2.85	1.22	58.232	.0000	118.67	.0000
	PRN	172	26(14.6%)	36(20.4%)	42(23.6%)	42(23.6%)	32(18.0%)	3.07	1.32				
	COS	192	13(6.7%)	26(13.4%)	35(18.0%)	61(31.4%)	59(30.4%)	3.66	1.24				
	SUP	83	2(2.4%)	2(2.4%)	8(9.6%)	30(36.1%)	41(49.4%)	4.28	.92				
9	TEA	1999	148(7.4%)	296(14.8%)	773(38.6%)	560(28.0%)	226(11.3%)	3.21	1.06	34.517	.0000	160.28	.0000
	PRN	172	8(4.5%)	18(10.1%)	62(34.8%)	55(30.9%)	35(19.7%)	3.50	1.06				
	COS	197	10(5.0%)	23(11.6%)	48(24.1%)	63(31.7%)	55(27.6%)	3.70	1.15				
	SUP	82	3(3.7%)	3(3.7%)	8(9.8%)	26(31.7%)	42(51.2%)	4.23	1.02				
10	TEA	1989	162(8.1%)	525(26.3%)	573(38.8%)	552(27.7%)	181(9.1%)	3.03	1.10	23.574	.0000	143.54	.0000
	PRN	169	27(15.4%)	50(28.6%)	37(21.1%)	45(25.7%)	16(9.1%)	2.86	1.28				
	COS	195	36(18.3%)	64(32.5%)	29(14.7%)	49(24.9%)	19(9.6%)	2.75	1.28				
	SUP	83	33(39.8%)	33(39.8%)	4(4.8%)	7(8.4%)	6(7.2%)	2,04	1.20				

personnel should support organizations advocating negotiations as compared to superintendents who had the lowest incidence of agreement (28%). Approximately one-half of the teachers, principals, and central office staff favored the passage of a law regarding negotiations while only 13 percent of the superintendents agreed. Teachers and principals disagreed that professional harmony would be weakened by negotiations, while central office staff and superintendents felt just the opposite. There was considerable variance within each of the groups other than the superintendents regarding community support for school personnel involved in negotiations, but almost 70 percent of the superintendents indicated that their communities would look unfavorably on educators involved in the process. All four groups saw job security jeopardized by service withdrawal with superintendents having the strongest incidence of agreement. In fact, superintendents were strongly opposed to any type of service withdrawal which would disrupt school. Likewise, they felt more strongly than other respondents that negotiations protect the incompetent teacher.

Hypothesis IV - There will be no significant difference in attitudes toward negotiations between tenured and nontenured teachers.

The hypothesis was accepted for items 6 and 10 and rejected for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8. amd 9 using the chi-square test. Utilizing the F-ratio statistic the hypothesis was accepted for items 5, 6, and 10 and rejected for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 as noted in Table V.

As stated earlier educators indicated their support for

TABLE V
ATTITUDINAL COMPARISONS BY TENURE ON ITEMS 1-10 - TOTAL GROUP

Item	Ten	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std. Dev.	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Square	Signif icance
1	TEN	1812	550(30.4%)	671(37.0%)	303(16.7%)	195(10.8%)	93(5.1%)	2.23	1.15	5.07	.023	30.26	.0000
	NON	662	174(26.3%)	311(47.0%)	117(17.7%)	42(6.3%)	18(2.7%)	2.12	0.96				
2	TEN	1816	471(25.9%)	694(38.2%)	364(20.0%)	195(10.7%)	92(5.1%)	2.31	1.12	4.99	.024	35.71	.0000
	NON	663	112(16.9%)	275(41.5%)	182(27.5%)	75(11.3%)	19(2.9%)	2.42	0.99				
3	TEN	1812	462(25.5%)	615(33.9%)	404(22.3%)	218(12.0%)	113(6.2%)	2.40	1.17	11.31	.001	31.11	.0000
	NON	662	159(24.0%)	280(42.3%)	157(23.7%)	45(5.8%)	21(3.2%)	2.23	0.99				
4	TEN	1816	185(10.2%)	340(18.7%)	342(18.8%)	693(38.2%)	256(14.1%)	3.27	1.21	20.69	.000	41.15	.0000
	NON	660	23(3.5%)	96(14.5%)	152(23.0%)	299(45.3%)	90(13.6%)	3.51	1.01				
5	TEN	1818	141(7.8%)	487(26.8%)	587(32.3%)	439(24.1%)	164(9.0%)	3.00	1.09	1.29	.256	27.98	.0000
	NON	662	28(4.2%)	192(29.0%)	262(39.6%)	147(22.2%)	33(5.0%)	2.95	0.94				
6	TEN	1811	232(12.8%)	617(34.1%)	466(25.7%)	403(22.3%)	93(5.1%)	2.73	1.10	2.56	.106	8.09	.0883
	NON	662	91(13.7%)	226(34.1%)	182(27.5%)	146(22.1%)	17(2.6%)	2.66	1.05				
7	TEN	1819	240(13.2%)	307(16.9%)	542(29.8%)	400(22.0%)	330(18.1%)	3.15	1.27	10.47	.002	30.83	.0000
	NON	660	76(11.5%)	148(22.4%)	222(33.6%)	147(22.3%)	67(10.2%)	2.97	1.15				
8	TEN	1816	274(15.1%)	377(20.8%)	460(25.3%)	428(23.6%)	277(15.3%)	3.03	1.29	16.73	.000	36.48	.0000
	NON	661	107(16.2%)	151(23.3%)	223(33.7%)	120(18.2%)	57(8.6%)	2.80	1.17				
9	TEN	1814	126(6.9%)	236(13.0%)	645(35.6%)	526(29.0%)	281(15.5%)	3.33	1.10	7.15	.005	10.18	.0374
	NON	660	46(7.0%)	106(16.1%)	253(38.3%)	179(27.1%)	76(11.5%)	3.20	1.06				
10	TEN	1800	203(11.3%)	497(27.6%)	469(26.1%)	467(25.9%)	164(9.1%)	2.94	1.16	2.46	.113	5.21	.2665
	NON	659	56(8.5%)	179(27.2%)	178(27.0%)	189(28.7%)	57(8.6%)	3.01	1.12				

organizations which advocate negotiations, identified TEA-NEA as the organization which could best represent them, and supported passage of a law to provide for negotiations. As a group, nontenured teachers agreed significantly more than tenured teachers with each of these items. Regarding the withholding of services for higher salaries, nontenured educators agreed more than disagreed while tenured educators disagreed more than agreed. Similar findings were recorded on two other items related to the withholding of services where tenured educators had a higher incidence of disagreement than the nontenured educators. The fact that there was a difference in the significance on the two statistical tests on item five, community support for school personnel involved in negotiations, may be attributed to the large percentage of educators, both tenured and nontenured, located in the undecided category.

Hypothesis V - There will be no significant difference toward negotiations between educators from the various sizes of school districts.

The hypothesis was accepted for items 6, 7, and 8 and rejected for items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, and 10 in both statistical tests. The results are in Table VI.

The majority of educators from all three sizes of school districts agreed with supporting appropriate organizations and the passage of a negotiation's status, but the highest incidence of agreement was recorded in medium size districts. Medium and large size school districts had a higher percentage of educators disagreeing that professional harmony would be threatened by negotiations than did the smaller districts.

TABLE VI

ATTIDUDINAL COMPARISONS BY SCHOOL SIZE ON ITEMS 1-10 TOTAL GROUP

Item	Size	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std Dev	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Sq	Signif icance
1	SM	1188	273(23.0%)	503(42.3%)	221(18.6%)	140(11.8%)	51(4.3%)	2.32	1.08	12.051	.000	49.69	.0000
	MD	554	193(34.8%)	213(38.4%)	88(15.9%)	38(6.9%)	22(4.0%)	2.07	1.07				
	LG	740	254(36.5%)	270(36.5%)	112(15.1%)	63(8.5%)	41(5.5%)	2.14	1.15				
2	SM	1193	267(22.4%)	507(42.5%)	241(20.2%)	127(10.6%)	51(4.3%)	2.32	1.07	8.158	.001	26.69	.0008
	MD	555	154(27.7%)	211(38.0%)	120(21.6%)	53(9.5%)	17(3.1%)	2.22	1.06				
	LG	739	161(21.8%)	257(34.8%)	184(24.9%)	93(12.6%)	44(6.0%)	2.46	1.14				
3	SM	1189	242(20.4%)	437(36.8%)	291(24.5%)	145(12.2%)	74(6.2%)	2.47	1.13	14.018	.000	34.65	.0000
	MD	555	171(30.8%)	208(37.5%)	106(19.1%)	48(8.6%)	22(4.0%)	2.17	1.08				
	LG	738	206(27.9%)	252(34.1%)	163(22.1%)	76(10.3%)	41(5.6%)	2.31	1.15				
4	SM	1191	108(9.1%)	244(20.5%)	264(22.2%)	447(37.5%)	128(10.7%)	3.20	1.15	13.900	.000	45.06	.0000
	MD	553	34(6.1%)	85(15.4%)	109(19.7%)	246(44.5%)	79(14.3%)	3.45	1.10				
	LG	740	66(8.9%)	113(15.3%)	122(16.5%)	303(40.9%)	136(18.4%)	3.45	1.21				
5	SM	1189	52(4.4%)	319(26.8%)	409(34.4%)	314(26.4%)	95(8.0%)	3.07	1.01	7.000	.001	36.27	.0000
	MD	555	46(8.3%)	151(27.2%)	187(33.7%)	136(24.5%)	35(6.3%)	2.93	1.05				
	LG	744	72(9.7%)	207(27.8%)	258(34.7%)	139(18.7%)	68(9.1%)	2.90	1.10				
6	SM	1190	160(13.4%)	412(34.6%)	318(26.7%)	257(21.6%)	43(3.6%)	2.67	1.07	1.816	.161	6.72	.5672
	MD	555	62(11.2%)	189(34.1%)	143(25.8%)	133(24.0%)	28(5.0%)	2.78	1.09				
	LG	736	99(13.5%)	246(33.4%)	187(25.4%)	165(22.4%)	39(5.3%)	2.73	1.11				
7	SM	1190	144(12.1%)	215(18.1%)	361(30.3%)	276(23.2%)	194(16.3%)	3.14	1.24	1.626	.195	7.37	.4977
	MD	554	84(15.2%)	96(17.3%)	177(31.9%)	116(20.9%)	81(14.6%)	3.03	1.26				
	LG	742	85(11.5%)	146(19.7%)	224(30.2%)	162(21.8%)	125(16.8%)	3.13	1.24				
8	SM	1191	172(14.4%)	253(21.2%)	310(26.0%)	288(24.2%)	168(14.1%)	3.02	1.26	1.965	.138	11.37	.1815
	MD	555	86(15.5%)	121(21.8%)	174(31.4%)	107(19.3%)	67(12.1%)	2.91	1.23				
	LG	739	123(16.6%)	159(21.5%)	199(26.9%)	156(21.1%)	107(13.8%)	2.94	1.28				

Continued on next page

Item	Size	N	Strongly Agree Freq(%)	Agree Freq(%)	Undecided Freq(%)	Disagree Freq(%)	Strongly Disagree Freq(%)	Mean	Std Dev	F Ratio	F Prob	Chi Sq	Significance
9	SM	1190	72(6.1%)	140(11.8%)	440(37.0%)	367(30.8%)	171(14.4%)	3.36	1.06	3.502	.029	16.78	.0325
	MD	556	47(8.5%)	80(14.4%)	209(37.6%)	145(26.1%)	75(13.5%)	3.22	1.11				
	LG	736	52(7.1%)	121(16.4%)	252(34.2%)	198(26.9%)	113(15.4%)	3.27	1.12				
10	SM	1179	109(9.2%)	358(30.4%)	337(28.6%)	285(24.2%)	90(7.6%)	2.91	1.10	5.962	.003	36.54	.0000
	MD	550	51(9.3%)	128(23.3%)	148(26.9%)	158(28.7%)	65(11.8%)	3.11	1.16				
	LG	738	100(13.6%)	194(26.3%)	164(22.2%)	216(29.3%)	64(8.7%)	2.93	1.20				

Medium and large size school district educators agreed more than disagreed that their community would support school personnel during negotiations, while educators from small school districts reported more disagreement than agreement. Conflicting perceptions were revealed regarding the protection of the incompetent teacher by negotiations. Small and large district school personnel were in more agreement than disagreement with the item, while medium size districts disagreed more than agreed.

SUMMARY

The results from this investigation indicate that as a whole Tennessee school personnel support organizations which advocate the use of professional negotiations. However, few superintendents are in support of such organizations with almost two-thirds of those responding disagreeing with it. Teachers tend to favor negotiations more strongly than any other school personnel groups with 73.5 percent of those responding in favor and only 9.9 percent opposing it. More than 50 percent of all personnel groups believe the TEA-NEA to be the organization which can best acquire benefits for them. Teachers and superintendents are in disagreement on the passage of legislation allowing for professional negotiations with teachers favoring it (73.5%) and superintendents disagreeing with it (64.6%) against.

There was no school personnel group which favored with over 50 percent the withholding of services. The teacher

group was approximately evenly split on the questions with close to 30 percent undecided and the superintendents were definitely opposed to it.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings reported in the study the following recommendations are presented for consideration:

1. Local school systems should conduct a similar study in an effort to determine the specific attitudes of their professional school personnel toward organized negotiations.

2. Systems with organized negotiations already in use should be requested to aid other school systems during in-service with ideas concerning teacher attitudes, role of administrators, impact of negotiations, and other related problems that arise.

3. Based on the results of this study, TEA should distribute information concerning negotiations and the attitudes of Tennessee's professional school personnel in order to enlighten those who are uninformed about organized negotiations.

It is suggested that superintendents and boards of education review salary schedules, fringe benefits, working conditions, and school board policies of their respective school districts and evaluate what could be done to improve these conditions. Representative groups of teachers in each district should be involved in the review process in order to further their understanding of the financial obligations, resources, and limitations of their particular school district. Through this kind of joint study and involvement, perhaps the gap in agreements and disagreements between the perceptions of teachers and superintendents could be narrowed.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Richard K. Fletcher, Jr., "Attitudes of School Personnel Toward Organized Arbitration and/or Negotiations," (Unpublished Paper, October 1975).

[2] Tennessee Department of Education, 1975-1976 Directory of Public Schools (Nashville, Tennessee: State Department of Education, 1975).

[3] Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Brent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 1.

[4] Ibid., p. 218.

[5] Ibid., p. 224.

[6] James David Wilson, "A Study of Progressiveness of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Their Community in Relation to Their Attitudes Toward Collective Action," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:4715A, May, 1970.

[7] James Ronald Fisher, "The Relationship of Sex, Level, and Position of Oregon Educators to Attitudinal Statements That Deal With Collective Negotiations and Sanctions," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:1918A, 1968.

[8] Geraldine Anne Evans, "Perceptions and Attitudes Toward the Use of Collective Bargaining Power, "Dissertation Abstracts, 29:3368A, 1969.

[9] George Gaylin Garver, "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan Concerning Collective Bargaining For Public School Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3929A, 1968.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Wilson, op. cit.

[12] Garver, op. cit.

[13] William Lauren Shell, "A Study of the Attitudes of Oklahoma Public School Elementary and Secondary Classroom Teachers and Public School Superintendents Toward Collective Negotiations," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:1793A, November, 1969.

[14] Marvin G. O'Hare, "Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Iowa Teachers and Superintendents," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:1341A, October, 1969.

[15] Bernard Queen, "Relationship of Teachers Collective Activity to Attitudes of Classroom Teachers, School Administrators, and School Board Members," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3435A, 1968.

[16] O'Hare, op. cit.

[17] Towers, Richard Lewis, "The Relationship Between Selected Variables and Attitudes of Teachers in South Carolina Toward Collective Action," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:5178A, June, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Evans, Geraldine Anne. "Perceptions and Attitudes Toward the Use of Collective Bargaining Power," Dissertation Abstracts, 29:3368A, 1969.

Fisher, James Ronald. "The Relationship of Sex, Level, and Position of Oregon Educators to Attitudinal Statements That Deal With Collective Negotiations and Sanctions," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:1918A, 1968.

Fletcher,Jr., Richard K. "Attitudes of School Personnel Toward Organized Arbitration and/or Negotiations," (Unpublished paper, October 1975).

Garver, George Gaylin. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining For Public School Teachers," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3929A, 1969.

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Brent. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

O'Hare, Marvin G. "Collective Negotiations as Perceived by Iowa Teachers and Superintendents," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:1341A, October, 1969.

Queen, Bernard. "Relationship of Teacher Collective Activity to Attitudes of Classroom Teachers, School Administrators, and School Board Members," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:3435A, 1968.

Shell, William Lauren. "A Study of the Attitudes of Oklahoma Public School Elementary and Secondary Classroom Teachers and Public School Superintendents Toward Collective Negotiations," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:1793A, November, 1969.

Tennessee State Department of Education. Approved Private and Special Schools for 1974-1975. Nashville: State Department of Education, 1975.

Towers, Richard Lewis. "The Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Teachers in South Carolina Toward Collective Action," Dissertation Abstracts, 30:5178A, June, 1970.

Wilson, James David. "A Study of Progressiveness of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Their Community in Relation to Their Attitudes Toward Collective Action," Dissertation Abstracts, 30;4715A, May, 1970.

APPENDIX A

ATTITUDE OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL TOWARD ORGANIZED NEGOTIATIONS AND/OR ARBITRATION

(A research study conducted by Dr. Richard K. Fletcher, Jr.; Dr. Jack L. Brimm; Dr. Daniel J. Tollett; and Dr. O. C. Stewart; College of Education, Tennessee Technological University.)

Your answers to this study are confidential. Do not write your name on the opinionnaire. Please respond to each of the items by placing the number representing your choice in the blank at the left of the item. The following scale is used for the first 10 items:

(1) Strongly Agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly Disagree

For this study the following definitions are used: Negotiations - A process whereby employers and employees strive to reach a mutually acceptable agreement on items of concern; Arbitration - A process involving a disinterested third party in the resolution of a disagreement between two parties.

( ) 1. Professional school personnel should support organizations which advocate negotiations and/or arbitration.

( ) 2. The organization which can best acquire the benefits and/or salaries for school personnel is the TEA-NEA.

( ) 3. I support the passage of a state or federal law which would allow school personnel to enter into formal negotiations with superintendents and school boards.

( ) 4. The professional harmony between teachers and administrative personnel will be weakened if organized negotiations and/or arbitration is begun.

( ) 5. I believe the community where I work would support school personnel if they entered into formal negotiations with my school board.

( ) 6. I believe that job security would be jeopardized if school personnel in my district withheld their services.

( ) 7. I would withhold my services for greater salary and/or benefits.

( ) 8. I would withhold my services for better working conditions in the form of smaller classes; fewer non-teaching duties and more adequate supplies.

( ) 9. I would withhold my services for such professional concerns as involvement in policy making.

( )10. The incompetent teacher is protected when organized negotiation efforts are utilized.

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING CATEGORICAL INFORMATION:

( )11. Sex (1) Male (2) Female

( )12. Age (1) under 25 (2) 25-29 (3) 30-39 (4) 40-49 (5) 50-over

( )13. My major responsibility is (1) faculty (2) principal (3) central office staff (4) superintendent.

( )14. I have obtained tenure in my school system. (1) yes (2) no